



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,782	08/21/2003	Yuji Kaneko	60303.35	6915
54070	7590	11/29/2005	EXAMINER	
NEOMAX CO., LTD. C/O KEATING & BENNETT, LLP 8180 GREENSBORO DRIVE SUITE 850 MCLEAN, VA 22102			SHEEHAN, JOHN P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1742	

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/644,782	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KANEKO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> John P. Sheehan	<b>Art Unit</b> 1742	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/985,671.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)            |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/21/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Priority***

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 09/985,671, filed on November 5, 2001.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The Examiner acknowledges receipt of the information disclosure statement submitted August 21, 2003. Applicants should note the change made by the Examiner to the citation of Reference 13, correcting the Japanese publication number, by changing JP 2000-219973 to JP 2000-219943. If this correction is not appropriate, applicants are requested to so inform the Examiner in their response to this Office action.
3. The information disclosure statement filed August 21, 2003 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because:
  - I. Reference 22 refers to an application serial number. However, the cited application has issued as a patent and therefore should be listed as the patent instead of the application (MPEP 609.04(a) (page 600-146, right column, second complete paragraph, Rev. 3, August 2005)).

The Examiner has considered the remaining references cited in this IDS.

***Specification***

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informality:

I. The Examiner objects to the specification at page 26, paragraph 0078, which cites and incorporates by reference US Application Serial No. 09/806,096. The Examiner questions the correctness of the cited serial number in that 09/809,096 does not relate to the instant field of technology. Applicants are advised that merely changing the serial number in the specification will raise the issue of new matter in that the cited application is also incorporated by reference and merely changing the serial number will incorporate different subject matter than originally incorporated at the time of filing. Further, even in the absence of the incorporation by reference merely changing the serial number still raises the question of new matter.

II. The Examiner objects to page 18, paragraph 0054, line 8, in that the status of 09/503,738 should be updated.

III. The Examiner objects to the first paragraph of the specification regarding the parent application. The status of the parent application should be updated.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1742

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

I. In claim 3, the penultimate line, the metes and bounds of the phrase, "substantially equal" are not clear. The term "substantially" is a term of degree that to have meaning must be defined in the specification, *Seattle Box Company, Inc. v. Industrial Crating & Packing, Inc.*, 221 USPQ 568. The specification does not define "substantially".

### ***Double Patenting***

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. Claims 1 to 11 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 to 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,491,765 in view of Hashimoto et al. (Hashimoto, JP 2000-219943, cited in the IDS submitted August 21, 2003) and ASM Handbook.

9. '765 claims a process for making an alloy powder for an R-Fe-B rare earth magnet comprising a first pulverization step of coarsely pulverizing the material alloy for rare earth magnets by hydrogen occlusion pulverization and a second pulverization step including removing at least part of the fine powder having a particle size of 1 micron or less just as recited in the instant claims.

10. Hashimoto teaches that in order to increase the density of sintered R-Fe-B magnet the rapidly cooled R-Fe-B alloy should contain 1 to 30 volume percent of chill crystals, i.e., chill structure that, overlaps the instant claims, which require 2 to 20 volume percent chill structure.

11. ASM Handbook teaches that by definition lubricants are added to powders before compaction so as to ease compaction and ejection of the compacted powder.

12. The instant claims and '765's claims differ in that the '765's claims do not recite that the magnetic alloy should contain 2 to 20 volume percent chill structure nor the use of a lubricant.

13. However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to rapidly cool the R-Fe-B alloy so as to contain 1 to 30 volume percent of chill crystals, i.e., chill structure which, so as improve the density of the sintered product as taught by Hashimoto. Further one of ordinary skill in the art would

Art Unit: 1742

have been motivated to add a lubricant to the powder so as to ease compaction of the powder and the ejection of the powder compact as taught by the ASM Handbook.

Claims 1 to 11 are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 1 to 17 of commonly assigned 6,491,765. Specifically, for reasons set forth above the instant claims are not patentably distinct from the claims of 6,491,765.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP § 2302). Commonly assigned US Patent 6,491,765, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee can, under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and 37 CFR 1.78(c), either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made, or name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications pending on or after December 10, 2004.



***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 1 to 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over US Patent No. 6,491,765 as set forth above.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).




Art Unit: 1742

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John P. Sheehan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1249. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F (6:45-4:30) Second Monday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
John P. Sheehan  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1742

jps